

<b>Act Number:</b>	09-171	
<b>Bill Number:</b>	966	
<b>Senate Pages:</b>	2994-3016	<b>23</b>
<b>House Pages:</b>	9643-9668, 9817-9830	<b>40</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	Judiciary: 4722-4724	<b>3</b>
	<b>Page Total:</b>	<b>66</b>

**S - 586**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2009**

**VOL. 52  
PART 10  
2958 - 3308**

ckd  
SENATE

179  
May 21, 2009

of the closing happening on one day, it happens after a weekend and things like that. But there's going to be some folks probably much better versed at these issues than I that can that can figure that out.

But, that being stated, I appreciate Senator McDonald's explanation of what this bill actually will do and possible ramifications on attorneys practicing law.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on Senate Bill 1160?

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

If there's no objection, might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on the floor to place the item on the Consent Calendar. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Number 492, File Number 714 and 957.  
Substitute for Senate Bill 966, AN ACT PROHIBITING  
BLOCKING THE BOX, favorable report of the Committee on  
Judiciary, and Planning and Development. Clerk is in

ckd  
SENATE

180  
May 21, 2009

possession of the amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage of the bill, sir, would you like to remark further?

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. President, this bill would allow municipalities with a population of more than 50,000 people to establish by ordinance a designation of intersections by the legislative body where the legislative body could post signs indicating that blocking the box, if you will, would no -- would be prohibited and subject to an infraction.

Mr. President, that blocking the box term would apply to a motor vehicle not proceeding into the intersection unless the vehicle was going to be able to traverse the intersection without obstructing passage of vehicles when traffic control signals would change. And I would urge passage of the bill. The legislation was -- was originally contemplated in a

ckd  
SENATE

181  
May 21, 2009

prior session of the General Assembly to apply for any municipality, though, some -- many members of the legislature who represents smaller towns were concerned and did not wish to have this legislation considered by their local legislative bodies, which is why it is limited to municipalities of 50,000 or more.

As a legislator representing an urban district, I can tell you that this type of situation is particularly of concern at rush hours in some parts of our state, and I know, Mr. President, that you would fully recognize the intersections that I might tell you about as a resident of -- Stamford where this is a particular problem. I do -- I would also like to just think the members of, actually, the Republican Party in my hometown particularly the Minority Leader of our legislative body, Representative Gabe DeLuca who brought this matter to our attention and asked that this chamber consider this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to ask a question of the

ckd  
SENATE

182  
May 21, 2009

proponent of this legislation, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Mr. President, could I please ask the proponent why this is limited to those municipalities above 50,000 population? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President.

As I indicated in my introduction of the legislation, when we previously proposed this in prior sessions of the General Assembly, there were many legislators from smaller communities who didn't think that this was a issue and shouldn't become an issue in their municipalities, objected to the inclusion of those small -- smaller communities and asked that any future legislation not involve those smaller communities. And that's why the number 50,000 was included to accommodate their concerns.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

ckd  
SENATE

183  
May 21, 2009

Further question, through you to the proponent of this legislation. There are other communities that may fit under the under-50,000 population but encompass a very busy thoroughfare -- fare, and I would point out that Route 7 in -- in the towns that I represent has a very high volume of cars passing through, and when we are under construction, as we are, and expanding our roadway, we oftentimes have a problem with just this issue. In fact, I know one, in particular, where there was a roadway going to the main train station in the town during construction that was blocked on a continuous basis and had an issue with not blocking the box.

I'd love to hear any reaction or comments by the proponent on an issue, such as this, as there probably are many other towns that fall in this category, possibly towns in the Route 6 corridor, Route 11 corridor, Route 25 corridor, and so forth, through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Through you, Mr. President. I certainly am familiar with some of the problems that Senator Boucher has identified, and I would be -- I mean, I

ckd  
SENATE

184  
May 21, 2009

originally proposed in prior sessions of the General Assembly that it -- it be available to all municipalities. I guess in some ways, Mr. President, this -- if this -- if this is adopted, in some ways this would be a trial run for municipalities of 50,000 or more. And if it worked out well, I suspect other legislators in other sessions of the General Assembly would ask that it be expanded to include any municipalities if they so chose to designate an intersection.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Mr. President, I really appreciate the response to my questions by the proponent. And I look forward to working very closely in future sessions to accomplish just such a goal. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, ma'am.

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I'd like to pose a question to the author of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

ckd  
SENATE

185  
May 21, 2009

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

-- the proponent. Through you, Mr. President. East Hartford as I -- as I understand East -- this is for cities of a population over 50,000. So if East Hartford has a population of 50,050, we would be eligible to participate in this program?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

That would be correct, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

So you would not be boxed in, Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

I wouldn't want a son of East Hartford boxed in. Thank you. Thinking -- thinking out of the box, we have over here on the right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to thank Senator McDonald for bring this forward. I know we saw a similar proposals last year, and I know we saw similar proposals in the Transportation Committee. I have to say every night I drive home I go up around the circle, Pulaski Circle, go up by the Wadsworth Atheneum and come down around by the -- the museum, the New Science Center Museum,

ckd  
SENATE

186  
May 21, 2009

and people block the box. They're just out there, hanging out there, and the people can't get across, and you can't get on the highway. And it's just very inconsiderate. You know, they're hoping that the lights are going to change and they're going to be able to make it through. And I'm sure they're not trying to be deliberately stopping traffic because they -- but everybody's, like, looking out for themselves. And I think this a very practical measure. I've seen it work in New York City. And I think it's a terrific idea. I'm glad we're finally doing this in Connecticut.

Thank you, Mr. President.

And thank you, Senator McDonald.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Through you, a couple questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President.

ckd  
SENATE

187  
May 21, 2009

Towns under 50,000, or everybody else, let's say in the State of Connecticut, or every town, for that matter, do they have the ability to propose this ordinance on their own without legislation? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Through you, Mr. President, no, they don't. They don't currently have that authority that -- that was actually a subject of inquiry in my city of Stamford and that's why the Republican members of our local legislative body brought this forward to my attention so that we could address it and provide those municipalities with that authority.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Through you, Mr. President, may I ask why they don't have the ability to impose something like this? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Through you, Mr. President, well, it is currently

ckd  
SENATE

188  
May 21, 2009

not an infraction to block an intersection. It may certainly be poor manners. It may certainly be against the -- the -- the normative rules of the road, but it's not against the law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Do muni -- thank you, Mr. President.

Through you, do the towns have the ability to put on their own books ordinances for other traffic violations or traffic law similar to this? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

You know, actually, let me clarify my prior remark. There would be nothing that would prevent a municipality from putting up a sign that says don't block the box. There would be something that would prevent anybody from issuing an infraction for actually blocking the box. I, perhaps, was a little bit too quick in answering Senator Kane's question on that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

ckd  
SENATE

189  
May 21, 2009

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Just two more questions if I might. Is this a mandate on our towns? I believe it says that the bill requires the municipality to post signs. I just wonder if that's a mandate on our towns, through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Well, no, Mr. President.

Through you, actually, in Subsection B, it says any municipalities with a population of more than 50,000 may by ordinance -- ordinance designate one or more intersections within that municipality so it's not a mandate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Great. Thank you, Mr. President.

One last question, what about the -- the -- the painting of the lines. Could there be any confusion with existing crosswalks that are generated in these intersections? And how would that interfere with those said crosswalks? Through you, Mr. President.

ckd  
SENATE

190  
May 21, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Through you, Mr. President, the language with respect to the painting was to try to describe something that is well known to many people who have, perhaps, visited New York City because that's exactly the type of hatched marking, if you will, that many people have seen painted on roads to delineate the box that we are hoping not to block.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I  
Thank the gentleman for his answers, and I appreciate clearing those items up for me.  
Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further?

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Every now and then as we're going through the session, if I don't serve on the committee, I get my

ckd  
SENATE

191  
May 21, 2009

Senate calendar, I start flipping through and seeing -- looking at some of the titles of the bills, and I saw Senate Bill 966, Blocking the Box. And I said, well, that sound's pretty interesting. I'm going to get on my computer up and look it up and see what it does. And I liked what I read. I think it's a -- it's a good tool to create -- or alleviate, I should say, the logjams that -- that occur. And we've heard from -- testimony from others already, and I think back to my personal experiences in my -- my life outside this chamber. If I'm working at a car accident or there's a disabled car on the roadway. And next thing you know, it's start backing up traffic. Well, in the cross streets, they can't go across because everybody's riding the bumper of the car in front of them. And before you know it, the horns start blasting. People get out of their cars. We've had to clear accident scenes to go to address road rage issues because people were upset that somebody was so close to their car or they got so close in cross traffic they caused another accident, thus, exacerbating the whole situation. So I said this is a great bill. Great tool for law enforcement. But, then, I read that actual details of the bill, and I was disappointed that it showed that your

ckd  
SENATE

192  
May 21, 2009

municipality had to have a residency a 50,000 cars -- or 50,000 persons are more.

Now, I have in my district -- one of my towns -- there's over 30,000 cars that travel through that town on one particular road on a daily basis. So I felt it was unfair that we should just put a provision that says it has to be 50,000 persons or more. So with that, Mr. President, the clerk has in his possession LCO 7484. I ask that it be called, and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO 7484 to be designated Senate Amendment Schedule A, is offered by Senator Witkos of the 8th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Would you like to remark further, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS:

Yes. Just one quick comment, Mr. President. We

ckd  
SENATE

193  
May 21, 2009

often talk about local control. We don't like to see local control from our local elected officials but yet this bill does just exactly that. We're not going to give every local official the opportunity to enact this ordinance if they so choose. I find it wrong that a legislator would come up and say don't put that into my small town because I don't want my elected officials to make that determination if it's good for their community or not. This will allow everybody, every municipality in our state, if they want to adopt the legislation then that will be a local decision. I asked the chamber for its indulgence and passage of the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on Senate A?

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Mr. President, I rise sadly in opposition to the amendment because it actually would achieve something that I originally tried to do a couple of years ago. And I am certainly not here to -- to represent the views of those who opposed this leg -- type of legislation for smaller communities because, I think,

ckd  
SENATE

194  
May 21, 2009

Senator Witkos is correct that it could be useful for smaller towns that might happen to have large traffic volume. But I know that that was a basis for this legislation being defeated in the last -- the last time it was offered so I would oppose the amendment. And, frankly, the opposition was more in the House than it was up here. So with all due respect to Senator Witkos and the amendment, I would ask members of the chamber to oppose this. If there is consensus in the House and they want to actually add it, I would be happy to urge members to adopt that amendment if -- if it came back. But, for now, Mr. President, I would oppose the amendment and ask that the vote be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote will be ordered.

Senator Boucher, ladies first.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President, much appreciated, I'm sure.

In having discussed this bill just a minute ago and getting assurances of working on this in the future to help accommodate our smaller towns, I did not realize I'd be provided with such a -- an opportunity so soon to address the very concerns that

ckd  
SENATE

195  
May 21, 2009

were just mentioned. And I do thank my colleague, Senator Witkos, for bringing this -- this amendment forward because it really does address the circumstances that we have. I think towns should be allowed to on -- on at-will basis to take advantage of this if they so choose, giving local control. Because, as I pointed out, recently, and so many of you know about the Route 7 corridor issues of congestion and problems that we've had over the many years and how we're addressing those by doing a landmark widening project that has been ongoing for the last three or four years, and very well I might add, to often we like to criticize our Department of Transportation. Here's a wonderful opportunity that I have to compliment them, to commend them, on the great work that they're doing, how well they've communicated with our -- with our first selectman and our board of selectman and with the town on -- during this very arduous process. But, early in this process, they did have a lot of traffic and construction occurring at a very difficult location where there was a road going to our main train station, one of our corporate buildings, where there was a great deal of traffic every day within just a few feet of another major intersection, creating a bottleneck that was near

ckd  
SENATE

196  
May 21, 2009

impossible for individuals to get through, to the point where that intersection had to be closed and a new -- new road created with a traffic light.

So, for future situations, such as this, this amendment would go a long way to resolving the issue. For that reason, I -- I heartily support this amendment, and I hope it can be perceived as friendly. And it certainly is the appropriate place to start here in the Senate since it has not gone down to the House to make all the appropriate changes that would help so many of our smaller communities.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Boucher.

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Mr. President, thank you allowing me to rise for a second time.

I just had an opportunity to speak with Senator Witkos, and, based on that conversation, Mr. President, I would reverse my position, and he is very persuasive one on one. And he assures me that -- that if this amendment is adopted here, he will use his best efforts in the House to ensure passage in the House, as well.

ckd  
SENATE

197  
May 21, 2009

THE CHAIR:

He didn't have his infraction book at the time with him, Senator McDonald, did he?

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Nor his uniform on, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

There you go. All right. Would you like to discuss Senate 8 further? If -- if not, we have a roll call vote.

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Mr. President, based on my most recent comments, I no longer request a roll call vote either.

THE CHAIR:

Let me try your minds then.

All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it. Senate A is adopted. Will you remark further on Senate Bill 966 as amended by Senate A.

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Any -- any of you who have been to Boston, New York City or any other major metropolitan area know that

ckd  
SENATE

198  
May 21, 2009

this is a vital piece of traffic equipment, for lack of better word, or a designated area to allow traffic to move freely through, especially when it's backed up by police presence or at least a traffic authorities presence near that box with a -- with a ticket book out of their pocket, like there's no one ever stays in the box. But I can tell you we already have these boxes in the town that I live in, and they work like a charm. Even without the ability to give a ticket, to issue an infraction, they work like you wouldn't believe. People are scared to death of the box, and it really makes things a lot more efficient. And it's extremely rare that you see someone not understanding what the picture is all about. When you see a box, you just clearly don't go into it. And you try to get your car out of it. If there's -- if there's not a lot of room between you and car front of you that's stopped at the stoplight.

So I -- I think it makes good sense. I'm glad that we are in general agreement that it should apply to towns of all sizes, even if there was a cut off at 10,000 and we have towns in Connecticut that are smaller than 10,000, my message to them is that just -- just paint the lines, people. You don't even need to put up the signs. Just pay -- pay for the paint

ckd  
SENATE

199  
May 21, 2009

and it will work. People get the idea very, very quickly.

One quick question for the -- for Senator McDonald, through you, Mr. President. There is no amendment to exempt anybody in the box whose name is Jack; is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

There is no such language in the legislation.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you. That answers that question. I'm whole heartily in support of this.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Senator McDonald.

SENATOR MCDONALD:

Mr. President, if there's no objection, might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk --

ckd  
SENATE

200  
May 21, 2009

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if the Clerk might call the items on the second Consent Calendar and then if we might have a vote on that Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the second Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the second Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

Mr. President, those items are placed on the second Consent Calendar begin on Calendar page 22, Calendar Number 204, Substitute for Senate Bill 1009;

Calendar page 28, Calendar Number 358, Senate Bill 1078;

Calendar page 33, Calendar Number 473, Senate Bill 1160;

And Calendar 492, Substitute for Senate Bill 966.

Mr. President, that completes those items placed on the second Consent Calendar.

ckd  
SENATE

201  
May 21, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Please call for the Consent Calendar. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. The Senate is now voting by roll call on the second Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all Senators voted? If all Senators have voted, please check your vote. The machine will be closed.

THE CLERK:

The motion is on adoption of Consent Calendar Number 2

Total Number Voting	35
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 2 passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

**H – 1066**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2009**

**VOL.52  
PART 30  
9491 – 9840**

Without a traction, so ordered.

House will come back to order and we'll return to the call of the Calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar 659.

THE CLERK:

On page 44, Calendar 659, substitute for Senate Bill number 966, AN ACT PROHIBITING BLOCKING THE BOX favorable report of the Committee on Transportation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

A bill whose time has come. The distinguished Vice Chairman. Just a moment. Members please take your seats. I think we're down to a semi-dull roar.

The distinguished Vice Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report in concurrence with the Senate -- passage of the bill in concurrence with Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question's on acceptance of passage. Explain the bill please, sir.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill will allow municipalities to adopt ordinances that will designate

intersections where a motor vehicle would be prohibited from entering if the space that the vehicle's traveling on the opposite side of the intersection is too small for them to allow the vehicle to cross. It would apply even if the traffic light would permit the vehicle to proceed but it does not apply to entering an intersection to make a turn or to a tractor trailer.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would require the municipality to post signs. Madam Speaker, I'm sorry there was a switch. To post signs that blocking the intersection is prohibited and that violators could be subject to a fine. Madam Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO number 7484. I ask that it be called and I be permitted to summarize.

Deputy Speaker Orange in the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Will the Clerk please call LCO number 7484 designated previously as Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE CLERK:

LCO number 7484, Senate A offered by Senator Witkos.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The Representative seeks leave of the chamber to summarize. Is their objection? Objection? Hearing none, Representative Fox, please proceed, sir.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. What this amendment does is it strikes out a provision that the Judiciary Committee's original bill that would have limited this blocking the box municipal ordinance to communities that had 50,000 or more people. It was argued and argued successfully in the Senate that because it's enabling legislation and that it would solely require the local legislative bodies to make the decision that any municipality should they choose to do so should have the right to do so.

And I do want to make clear for purposes of this bill that this is enabling legislation. I also want to make clear that there's nothing in the bill that would abrogate the function of the State Traffic Commission. They're role would continue as currently exists. And I urge adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir. The question is on adoption. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule A? Will you remark further on A? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

All those opposed nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark further? Representative Cafero of the 142, Mr. Minority Leader, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, forgive me, I entered the chamber just moments ago. And if in fact the proponent of the bill described it I was unable to hear it. And what I guess I have a general concept of what we're talking about here; blocking the box. That's blocking an intersection. Is that correct? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (146th):

And through you, Madam Speaker, within the context of the bill now as amended is the box area, that intersection area defined? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, according to the bill the box would be defined first through signs that would -- that would be posted that say blocking the intersection is prohibited. Also there would be white lines that would mark the intersection's boundaries and the area within it -- with parallel diagonal lines which would be at least one foot wide which would be quote, unquote the box. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (146th):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, I know there's obviously hundreds and thousands of intersections throughout the State of Connecticut. Would this bill apply to all of those? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, no, it would not. It would only apply to those intersections that a local legislative body designated as being areas where this legislation should apply and they would have to approve that legislation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

So through you, Madam Speaker, it's up to a city or municipality to designate which of their intersections within their jurisdiction they care to apply this rule to. Is that correct? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Yes, Madam Speaker, that is correct and also if it is a State road it would require the approval of the State Traffic Commission as well. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, if let's say a small town has 20 intersections and they care to designate two as ones that would be subject to this bill. They would vote

upon that. Is there any other procedure than just taking a vote? What would be the next actual step they would have to do so that the public was aware that these two of 20 in my hypothetical intersections would fall within the parameters of this bill? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think the question may have two parts. If the question is whether the local -- or the citizens are aware that their local municipality is about to act and in terms of designating intersections then whatever their you know, notice procedure with respect to enacting legislation would be I'm sure must be followed. With respect to once it is designated then there would be signs that would have to be posted as well as the intersection's boundaries would need to be clearly marked and the area within which would be designated as the box would need to be clearly marked. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, is there any

law  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

405  
June 2, 2009

coincidence to the fact that the title of this bill and your last name rhyme? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

It's dinner. I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I do not think so, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, is the blocking of the intersection an act that would be subject to penalty under this provision? Is it one that would be subject to penalty if it was intentional or not? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if an individual is blocking the box essentially, that would be subject to the fine. But as in many motor vehicle infractions, as this would be, there can

sometimes be a justification for why you are committing that infraction and I'm sure that that could be discussed with the officer if pulled over. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well through you, Madam Speaker, I guess I take it from the gentleman's remarks then that there is anticipated defenses to the potential infraction. Is that correct? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that's correct but I should point out that you shouldn't -- the purpose is not to enter the intersection unless you can get clearly through it to the opposite side. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well through you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. I'm sure it's happened to others in the room. Sometimes your car stalls. I know especially with younger drivers driving a stick

shift it stalls out in the middle of the intersection. Would that be -- if your car had a mechanical failure, god forbid, ran out of gas, had a flat tire, would any of those be defenses to this infraction? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, I would think so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, does the language of the bill anticipate such defenses? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, the language of the bill does say don't enter the intersection unless you can get through to the opposite side. If an individual does -- I don't believe any of our infractions that we deal with, if an individual's car breaks down or they have a flat tire they may, you know, subsequently be in violation somehow of an infraction of one of our motor vehicle infractions because of simply where their car

ends up. And I think the objective at that point would simply be to get them some assistance. So, through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I'm sorry. I -- it's my understanding that our laws currently -- our motor vehicle laws especially would allow defenses to various infractions. For instance if you were -- well, and I guess -- I guess what I'm wondering is if in fact you stalled out in the middle of an intersection and a policeman approached, you said my car is stalled. I can't get it started. Or you were able to get it started after it conked out and then move along. And frankly would have a tough time verifying that it had stalled during that interim period. Would the law as written or to your knowledge currently provide any defense towards -- to that individual from receiving an infraction? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, the violation would be that the individual entered the intersection without sufficient distance

to get across to the other side -- sufficient space to get across to the other side. So, so long as the individual entered the intersection with sufficient space if their car stalled or if they received a flat tire while in that box I do not believe that would be a violation because they would -- the violation is entering the intersection without sufficient space. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, what problem is I guess this bill attempting to solve? Through you, Madam Speaker. Other than the obvious. In other words has there been a -- have local police been unable to prevent the kind of obstruction of traffic that is caused by such a thing because there's no law against it? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, this legislation -- a similar concept was adopted in New York City and where -- if some of the members have traveled they may see the boxes and the signs posted. What it is trying to solve especially during periods of

heavy traffic and especially in some of our more populated areas is the situation where lights are changing, cars can't go anywhere because everyone is essentially blocking the box. And law enforcement has informed members of the Judiciary Committee that they don't necessarily have a provision by which they can enforce -- there's no motor vehicle infraction that necessarily would apply. What this would do is, if done properly would clearly mark this area that would be blocking the intersection. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well, through you, Madam Speaker, that brings up an interesting point. We're talking about obviously local roads. What prevents a municipality currently from passing various ordinances restricting the use and thereby penalizing the violation thereof of any of their roads? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if the town adopts an ordinance it would not be a State -- it could not be enforced through the State. It would not be a State infraction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well in other words if it -- through you, Madam Speaker, if a town designates a certain area of a street as no parking and someone parks there, what if any authority does the town have to penalize the individual who violated that parking law? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, most municipalities as I understand it would have a mechanism by which you could appeal a parking ticket. It may be a parking -- there might be a commission or a board that's set up to handle those matters. With respect to this because it would be -- this bill because it would be a motor vehicle infraction that would be enforced by the State, if somebody wanted to contest it they would then sign the back, say you know, not guilty, I wish to go to court, and

law  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

412  
June 2, 2009

they would have the opportunity to go to court. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if a local town sets a speed limit on its local road and someone violates that speed limit and they get pulled over by a local cop and they're given a ticket, what is the difference between that and a town who set the speed limit of that road also designating an intersection as not to be blocked and therefore subject to a ticket as well?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, moving violations tend -- as I understand them and as I -- I don't think I can think of an example where a moving violation would not be enforced by the State. So, with respect to the example that was provided if someone is speeding along a local road that still is enforceable by a State statute, whatever the charge -- whatever the infraction charge would be. And it would then proceed to, if

somebody was just to plead not guilty they would then proceed and go to court on that. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

So, through you, Madam Speaker, right now if I drove on a city street and I parked my car right in the middle of the road, threw it into park, sat there with my arms folded, there is absolutely nothing a police officer of that particular city could do to penalize me for doing such an act? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I do not -- I do believe that that would be a violation. I think that it would be an infraction. I'm not sure of the specific infraction and it would be enforceable by a police officer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well through you, Madam Speaker, if that -- you could do that now then what's the difference -- what does this bill allow

you to do that you can't do given in my hypothetical? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, there is a difference and with respect to the earlier scenario that was presented, with respect to parking the car in the middle of the road, and throwing your keys you know, into the bushes and saying I'm not going anywhere essentially. That could also be deemed to be an intentional act which could also involve additional potential charges. With respect to this bill and with respect to the blocking of the box this is similar to many of motor vehicle infractions that we have. This would be a situation where you do not, whether negligently or otherwise violate the provisions of this -- of this bill. And it would simply say you do not enter the box unless you can get across to the other side. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker and to Representative Fox, and yes I do practice law but I don't quite understand certainly

motor vehicle law. It's been awhile since I've been in criminal court or motor vehicle court for that matter. But let me try to understand this. Let's face it. How does the box get blocked? Somebody's trying to beat a light or rush through and all of a sudden traffic starts to back up and you find yourself who had the green light now in the middle of the intersection with nowhere to go because you were, I don't know, crowding the car in front of you or whatever. There's no way under current law that if a police officer observed that and thought that it was intentional because of your hurried driving or whatever you want -- your impatience as a commuter, that they couldn't stop you and give you a ticket? A ticket that you could appeal? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, there is a real question as to that because if an individual is driving while the light is green yet they cannot proceed because there's a car in front of them, then a police officer would -- would be -- there's a very good chance that police officer may say I cannot offer a ticket or give you a ticket at this time because there's no clear violation. Through you, Madam Speaker.

law  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

416  
June 2, 2009

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

And yet through you, Madam Speaker, if we were to pass the bill in your hypothetical, Representative Fox, the police officer would be allowed to give him a ticket because there is a clear violation? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, in the scenario described in the previous question with respect to trying to inch forward, trying to you know, go through a light where there's traffic that has backed up that would be a violation because the driver would have entered the intersection without a clear path to get through to the other side of the box. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I guess what I'm saying is we all find ourselves in that situation sometimes. For instance, in the city of Norwalk as you get to the top of the hill of

Route 123, New Canaan Avenue, you take a left onto Main Street. So the light turns green and you take a left onto Main Street. That's how I get to the Capital every day. Except there's a Dunkin Donuts right around the corner so everybody -- there's a drive thru, and everybody stops. So you find yourself -- you've got the green light, there's a space in front of you, you proceed straight ahead, not to do so you got nine people beeping at you behind you, you pull up and you got to stop, you're in the middle of the intersection because people are waiting in line to go to the drive thru for Dunkin Donuts.

Right now, would there be any cause for a witnessing police officer because I would be blocking and half-block the intersection to give me an infraction ticket? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I do not -- can not think of the infraction that would be charged at that point because everything that was described was within the boundaries of the law as I know it. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Okay. So through you, Madam Speaker, we pass this law, same scenario happens. Could the officer then give me a ticket under this law? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if the Norwalk City Council first concludes that this is an intersection that they would like to have marked. And if it is clearly marked and if the lines are clearly drawn and if the driver goes through the intersection or attempts to go through the intersection without a clear path to get to the other side, then yes, there could be a violation. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Well, through you, Madam Speaker, in the scenario that I gave that frankly I live every day in the road that I just witnessed to you, I'm never blocking the intersection intentionally. Because in many cases as we all know the light before an intersection might be a good distance from the actual left or right-hand turn. So when the light turns green, you

have a line of traffic behind you, you proceed to make your turn into the intersection. It might be 20, 30 feet before you're in the middle of the intersection whereupon now you realize you're backed up because of traffic that is already in the line going in the direction you're headed.

In either case it's not your fault. You didn't do anything wrong. What you're telling me now is a police officer under current law would not be able to give you a ticket but under this law he would. And what -- I guess what I'm saying is we usually give tickets when somebody's behavior, or course, is intentional in breaking the law. In my particular case, my movement into the intersection in my hypothetical was intentional but my breaking the law or blocking the intersection was not.

In fact, through you, Madam Speaker, in the various examples you gave as cited in New York City, for instance, where inching up and blocking an intersection causes problems. I bet you at least 50 percent of the cases, that blocking is not intentional. There seems to be a clear path to go forward. It seems like the traffic in front of you is moving forward. You're proceeding along with traffic when all of a sudden something stops and you find yourself incapable of moving forward and you're stuck in the middle of an intersection. It

wasn't your intention to be stuck there. You didn't want to be stuck there.

In fact there's no advantage to you being stuck there but in the normal course of obeying our laws of traffic and driving, when the light turns green, a space ahead of you, you proceed straight ahead, but because of some unforeseen circumstances before you -- in some cases 12 or 13 car lengths before you, you find yourself stuck in the middle of an intersection.

Now all of a sudden where that would have been a permissible incident under current law, you find yourself saying you've just broken State law and you're subject to an infraction. That's the concern I have. Is there anything -- and there might well be, in my hypothetical that would -- that I've stated wrong or incorrectly and if you could straighten me out on that. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and maybe I've complicated it more than it needs to be. When you enter an intersection if -- I'll start at the beginning. If your local council adopts this bill or attempts to enact enabling legislation that will prohibit blocking the box and if there's a clearly marked --

they would then be required to clearly mark the area saying, before you enter this intersection don't -- you know, don't block the box essentially. There will be lines that need to be drawn that would say before you enter into this intersection you need to make sure that you can get through to the other side.

So you need to know when you're approaching that intersection that -- that this is an intersection that does back up -- or you would be advised because of the sign that this is an intersection that it potentially can back up and before you enter the intersection you should make sure that you could see through to the other side. So, through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen is that real life? Is that what happens? How many times have you folks been in a car, you're at a light, you're at an intersection, the light changes green, you proceed forward, and all of a sudden before you completely make the turn as you find yourself in the middle of the intersection there's some car in front of you. Maybe they're waiting to make a left-hand turn into a bank, a drive in, a Dunkin Donuts, a driveway, whatever it might be. It's not your fault. You weren't intending to do it. You did

everything right. You were at a stop sign or a stop light. There was nothing ahead of you. You went forward. And all of a sudden you're stopped because you can't move because there's a car in front of you. That happens to us every day, sometimes six, seven, eight times a day. Now all of a sudden you just broke a State law.

I guess I keep going back to that question. You've got to ask for so many of these things, why are we doing this? What are we doing this for? I don't quite understand it. I don't care if you clearly delineate the box. You've got signs. I will sit there saying I will not break the law. I see the sign. I see the box. Everything's painted clearly. The light turns green. I proceed, bada bing, I got a car in front of me. What am I supposed to do about it? Now all of a sudden I broke the law. That's not real life, folks.

This bill does not reflect real life. Now it's one thing to make sure that we have the proper traffic rule and regulations to keep our streets orderly. It's one thing to give the power to our municipalities to enforce or put forth those kind of laws but it's quite another thing to just to go out hunting for trouble here. Are we going to try raise revenue by doing this? This is a whole new revenue stream. Maybe that's the purpose of it.

We're going to start handing out infractions for people who drive what we think is normal every day. I've got to tell you, I think that happens to me 12 times a day. The light turns green, I proceed, bada bing I'm stuck because there's a line of traffic and now it's an infraction? You know there's so many things we should be doing in this chamber. I'm not so sure blocking the box is one of them. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Denise Merrill.

REP. MERRILL (54th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I would move at this time that we pass this item temporarily.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The motion is to pass this item temporarily. Is there objection? Hearing none, pass temporarily.

The chamber will stand at ease please.

(Chamber at ease.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

On page 44, Calendar 659 substitute for Senate Bill number 966, AN ACT PROHIBITING BLOCKING THE BOX. It's amended by Senate A.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate A.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The question is acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill with Senate A. Will you remark?

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill had been discussed previously. The Senate A had been passed in the House and I urge passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The question is on passage. Will you remark? Will you remark?

Representative Cafero of the 107, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Excuse me, Representative Cafero of the 142, you have the floor, Mr. Leader.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the correction and I appreciate it. Madam Speaker, block the box is back and we've had a good amount of time to discuss it. I think Representative Fox and I met for several hours behind closed doors to discuss the intricacies and nuances of this bill. So for legislative intent I'd like to ask a few questions through you to Representative Fox.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please frame your question and please proceed, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you. Representative Fox, if you might recall several hours ago when we discussed this last I gave you a hypothetical of me crossing an intersection whereupon I would proceed thinking it's clear and then all of a sudden there's a line of traffic and bada bing I'm in the middle of the intersection. That sounded like that would not be, as you explained it to me in our back door meeting, that was not an intentional act and therefore I could at the very least escape prosecution or the receipt of an infraction by alleging that the intersection block

was certainly not of my doing in that it -- because of traffic.

Am I correct in that thing? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and as the distinguished Minority Leader and I have discussed several times over the last few hours, the infraction would be if you entered the box, essentially the box when the box is not open to be entered. For -- if there are cars that are currently there. So if the distinguished Minority Leader had entered the area that is designated as the box and that area had been clear at the time that he entered then he discussed certain potential problems with his car et cetera that could potentially cause him to stop in the intersection. That would not be the infraction. The infraction is if you can see clearly that it is not clear yet you still decide to enter into that area that is designated as the box. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, I feel a lot better having known that. I also -- one of the experts or certainly

great authorities on this subject, Professor Gabe DeLuca from Stamford, Connecticut also was able to enlighten me on some of the intricacies of the bill. And it's not that bad, Madam Speaker. I had first thought, what a disaster this could be and all of a sudden I find out, hey, you know what, you listen, you learn. And I'm here to say I'm still open to this debate. And you know maybe the box thing isn't that bad a deal. So let's proceed. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Bada bing. Thank you. Will you care to remark further?  
Will you care to remark further?

Representative Scribner of the 107, you have the floor,  
sir.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, a question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Just for a matter of legislative intent, could the proponent please clarify in reference of the language as I recall this must be approved of by the legislative body of a municipality. Is that correct?

law  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

576  
June 2, 2009

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

And in that we had some lengthy discussion, I believe it was yesterday with Representative Kehoe over the definition of a legislative body. Would you please for the benefit of our legislature explain to us what your interpretation of the legislative body be?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I don't have a precise definition with me, but in Stamford it is the local board of representatives. In other towns it is the city council. Other towns may have different entities. Whatever would make the laws involving ordinances or allowing certain -- this type of action. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you for that clarification and I share a similar assessment. I wish you had perhaps offered that help to Representative Kehoe earlier yesterday. In addition to that I believe that there was also a suggestion that if -- if a subject intersection was part of a State road that over and above the local ordinance to create the box, that it would have to go before the State Traffic Commission. I didn't see the specific reference to that in the language that was before me but I think I heard you say that that would be the case and I think that is current law. Could you please confirm that? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you. I know that the original proposal was amended within Planning and Development as I recall and I think it had

to do with creating an exemption for tractor trailer trucks from this proposal. Is that true? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

And just one more question. In regard to the white lining that is to be created in such a boxed intersection. Are there specific specifications that are required in that -- that lining provided to a municipality so that it is in some way uniform. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, as with many of our roads the lines would be according to the bill in white paint and not less than one foot in width within that area. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just in closing, I did want to comment on the proponent's tie. It's quite dashing. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Okay. Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark further? Representative Candelora of the 86, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I may, just a couple of questions to the proponent of the --

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. My questions really pertain to -- I think as Representative Scribner pointed out -- of when a -- the situation arises on a State road. I think it seems pretty clear that in a local road situation the municipality could invoke this provision by passing an ordinance striping the roadways. As I read this, is the legislation still enabling in that the municipality would control what intersections would be subject to this law even if it is a State road. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, it is enabling but in order for a municipality to impose this legislation upon a State road they would also need the approval of the State Traffic Commission. They would have to meet whatever guidelines they set. So the State Traffic Commission could in fact say no if they chose -- if they felt that this was not appropriate.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And it's sort of my understanding that when we're dealing with State roads the local traffic authority is the decision maker, sometimes it's the police department. They would make a recommendation to their governing body to pass an ordinance and then a request would need to be made to the State Traffic Commission in order to be able to effectuate that changes of lining and striping the roadway. And I just wanted to be sure and to make this clear that in need to get STC approval that it doesn't allow the State work in reverse where the State would be able absent municipal

ordinance to designate a State intersection for this provision. They necessarily would have to get approval via a municipal ordinance. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if the State -- I guess -- if I may, is the question, if the State decided that they wanted to do this on a State road would they require local, municipal approval through their law making body? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Clarification, Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes. My concern is today I think we're trying to create a local option. And of course involving State roads we're going to need to invoke STC. And I wanted to be clear here that the State would not have the ability to just impose this section on a municipality by saying, you know this intersection should be striped accordingly and it's going to a black block the box, that if it is a state road a local ordinance would need to trigger the provisions of this bill. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, the local municipal action would be -- by the lawmaking body would be the trigger. So of course if it is a State road then State approval would also be required through the State Traffic Commission. I do not believe it works in reverse. So I think local municipal approval would always be required. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate the answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you. Will you care to remark further on the bill?  
Will you care to remark further?

Representative Hennessy of the 127. Good morning, sir.

REP. HENNESSEY (127th):

Hello. How are you, Madam Speaker? I rise just the point of view having been a truck driver most of my life. Driving a large tractor trailer it's sometimes difficult to get all the way through the intersection so I was concerned about this bill. And I was happy that we were able to amend it to -- to not have

tractor trailers. But just for legislative intent I'd like to ask the proponent of the bill to, you know, to confirm that tractor trailers are not covered under this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th);

Through you, Madam Speaker, line 1, section 1 of the bill says no operator of a motor vehicle comma other than a tractor trailer unit comma. So they are excluded. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Hennessey.

REP. HENNESSEY (127th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The debate that occurred earlier between the Minority Leader and Representative Fox I think highlighted the fact that it takes a lot of responsibility to be on the road and you have to make adequate decisions when entering an intersection and that is most especially true if you happen to operate a large vehicle like a tractor trailer. So, you know, these issues are very important and I support the bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir for your comments. And when I said good morning to you, I just want to remind you that it's Wednesday. Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call.

Members to the chamber. The House is voting by roll call.

Members to the chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Have all members voted? Have all members voted? If all members have voted please check the board to be sure that your vote has been properly cast. If so, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. And will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 966 as amended by Senate A in concurrence with the Senate

Total number voting	141
Necessary for passage	71
Those voting Yea	138

law  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

585  
June 2, 2009

Those voting Nay 3

Those absent and not voting 10

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate. Will the  
Clerk please call Calendar number 249.

THE CLERK:

On page 6, Calendar 249, House Bill number 6523, AN ACT  
CONCERNING LICENSING OF ADOLESCENT SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT  
FACILITIES favorable report of the Committee on Human Services.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

My good friend from Meriden, Representative Abercrombie,  
you have the floor, ma'am. Good morning.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83rd):

Good morning, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Good morning to you.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83rd):

As we move into our last day of session. I move for the  
acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage  
of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's  
favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 15  
4598 - 4928**

**2009**

# **MTAC** *MOTOR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT, INC.*

**Statement of Michael J. Riley  
President**

**MICHAEL J. RILEY  
PRESIDENT**

**Motor Transport Association of Connecticut  
Before  
The Joint Committee on Judiciary  
March 19, 2009**

**Re: Senate Bill No. 966 AN ACT PROHIBITING BLOCKING  
THE BOX**

I am Michael J. Riley, President of Motor Transport Association of Connecticut (MTAC), a statewide trade association, which represents around 1,000 companies that operate commercial motor vehicles in and through the state of Connecticut. Our membership includes freight haulers, movers of household goods, construction companies, distributors, tank truck operators and hundreds of companies that use trucks in their business and firms that provide goods and services to truck owners.

**MTAC OPPOSES THIS BILL**

SB. No. 966. AN ACT PROHIBITING BLOCKING THE BOX is a well intentioned bill which presents unique problems to the trucking industry. It prohibits a motor vehicle from entering an intersection unless there is sufficient space on the opposite side of the intersection to accommodate such motor vehicle without obstructing the passage of other vehicles or pedestrians, notwithstanding the indication of a traffic control signal that would permit such operator to proceed.

The standard over-the-road trailer is 53 feet long. Tractors can be 15 to 25 feet long creating a combination of 60 to 75 feet in length. It is not uncommon for a tractor-trailer to cross an intersection in a line of other vehicles. The truck driver cannot predict that someone in that line might turn into the intersection and then take a quick left or right into a business or a side street. When this happens, all vehicles behind the turning vehicle must stop. It is possible that the trucker may not have totally cleared the intersection quickly, in this circumstance. He really hasn't done anything wrong but would be subject to an infraction under this proposal.



60 FOREST STREET • HARTFORD, CT 06105-3200 • TEL: (860) 520-4455 • FAX: (860) 520-4567



If a tractor-trailer driver actually did wait until traffic cleared on the other side of the intersection, it is very possible that the light could change and a significant backup of traffic could result.

We have a major problem with congested roads. This bill would make the situation worse.

We understand the problem contemplated by this bill, however, we really believe that the cure would be worse than the disease.

We also do not believe that a general law regulating every intersection in the state is necessary. If there are specific problem areas, the State Traffic Commission should study the situation and make recommendations, possibly including signage, which warns drivers against "blocking the box".

There is no evidence that this state has a major problem with people "blocking the box". It is unnecessary to pass this law.

Thank you.



900 Chapel St., 9th Floor, New Haven, Connecticut 06510-2807  
Phone (203) 498-3000 • Fax (203) 562-6314 • www.ccm-ct.org

**THE VOICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

## TESTIMONY

of the

### CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES

to the

### JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 19, 2009

The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local governments - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population.

We appreciate this opportunity to testify before this joint committee in support of the following bill of interest to towns and cities:

#### S.B. 966, "An Act Prohibit Blocking the Box"

S.B. 966 would prohibit motor vehicle drivers from "blocking the box" at intersections, and allow for imposition of fines for such traffic violations.

The intent behind "block the box" is to increase public safety (for pedestrians, as well as drivers) and reduce traffic congestion.

The "block the box" concept is usually used at busy intersections of cities and towns, and has been very successful in places as diverse as New York City and Miami-Dade County (Florida).

*CCM urges the Committee to favorably report S.B. 966, a useful tool to communities to protect pedestrians and reduce gridlock.*

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

If you have any questions, please call Ron Thomas or Gian-Carl Casa of CCM at (203) 498-3000.